



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

depended on a treaty which was never ratified, and that, therefore, the courts may review the findings of the United States commissioners. *United States v. Loo Way* (D. C.), 68 Fed. 475. That the law on the question involved in the principal case is still unsettled is shown by the fact that *Ex parte Lee Kow*, 161 Fed. 592, was decided less than a week after the principal case and upon a very different theory.

MASTER AND SERVANT—DISOBEDIENCE OF RULES LAID DOWN BY MASTER—ACTS OF VICE PRINCIPAL.—Plaintiff was injured while engaged in work which he knew was being negligently carried on in violation of the defendant's rules, but the work at all times was under the direction of the defendant's foreman. Held, that the master was liable. *Wiley v. St. Joseph Gas Co.* (1908), — Mo. App. —, 111 S. W. 1185.

The weight of authority is doubtless with this case. Where a servant is ordered to perform a particular act by one authorized to give orders for the master, he is not negligent in doing as directed, even though it is in violation of the rules of the master. *Pennsylvania Co. v. Roney, Admr.*, 89 Ind. 453; *Central Railroad v. DeBray*, 71 Ga. 406; *Kansas City, Fort Scott & Gulf Railroad v. Kier*, 41 Kan. 661; *Union Pacific Railroad Co. v. Springsteen*, 41 Kan. 724; *Hurlbut v. Wabash Railroad Co.*, 130 Mo. 657. In some of these cases it will be observed that there is the additional element of frequent violations of the rule in question. In cases where the master knows of the infraction, or where the violation is so habitual or customary that the master is charged with notice, it is usually held that the master has waived the rule. In the principal case the court says that a man can serve but one master, and if the company places its servants under a foreman, the orders of the foreman are the orders of the master, and if ordered to break the rules of the company it is not negligence to obey. All of the authorities, however, are not in accord with this doctrine. In *New York, Chi. & St. L. R. Co. v. Ropp*, 76 Ohio St. 449, 81 N. E. 748, the plaintiff, a car repairer, whose duty it was to be under cars, agreed in his contract of employment that he would see to it that the cars under which he should work were guarded with blue flags or lights. A foreman or boss asked him to assist in repairing an unguarded car; he obeyed, and was injured. Held that the master was not liable, that the regulation was reasonable, that the servant had disregarded the terms of his contract, that by so doing he was negligent, and could not recover. In *Keenan v. New York, Lake Erie & Western Railroad Co.*, 145 N. Y. 190, 45 Am. St. Rep. 604, where the rules of the company required all work upon cars to be done upon certain repair tracks, a gang boss of the master told the plaintiff that he had better do some work under a car which was not upon the repair track; held, that the master was not liable unless the boss had direct authority to change the rules of the company.

MASTER AND SERVANT—LIABILITY FOR INJURIES TO THIRD PARTIES—ACTS OF SERVANT—AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENT.—Plaintiff was knocked down and run over by the defendant's automobile driven by defendant's chauffeur, who had